	Case 3:11-cv-00924-L -MDD Document	24 Filed 12/22/11 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	SOUTHERN DISTRI	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 11	BRIAN SHAW,	CASE NO. 11cv924-L (MDD)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
13	VS.	MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA [Doc. No. 20]
14	HOMESERVICES LENDING LLC, et al.,	[500,110,20]
15	Defendants.	
16	Rack	ground
17	Background  Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Quash subpoenas to Plaintiff's current employer.	
18		
19		
20	or background checks; offer letters and employm	ent agreements; and, records of payments.
21	The case was brought by Plaintiff to reco	ver unpaid wages under federal and state law from
22	Plaintiff's former employer. Plaintiff, as the real	party-in-interest, opposes production of records
23	from Plaintiff's current employer on a variety of	grounds, including relevance, overbreadth and
24	based upon California's privacy laws. Defendants claim that the information is relevant asserting	
25	that Plaintiff's current employment is virtually id	lentical to Plaintiff's position with Defendant.
26	Consequently, say Defendants, Plaintiff's current	t record of wages and hours, as well as any records
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>	reflecting the manner in which Plaintiff characterized Plaintiff's employment with Defendant bear	
۷٥	upon Plaintiff's claims for unpaid wages from Do	efendant.

## Legal Standard

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally allow for broad discovery, authorizing parties to obtain discovery regarding "any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Also, "[f]or good cause, the court may order discovery of any matter relevant to the subject matter involved in the action." *Id.* Relevant information for discovery purposes includes any information "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence," and need not be admissible at trial to be discoverable. *Id.* There is no requirement that the information sought directly relate to a particular issue in the case. Rather, relevance encompasses any matter that "bears on" or could reasonably lead to matter that could bear on, any issue that is or may be presented in the case. *Oppenheimer Fund, Inc. v. Sanders*, 437 U.S. 340, 354 (1978). District courts have broad discretion to determine relevancy for discovery purposes. *See Hallett v. Morgan*, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir. 2002). Similarly, district courts have broad discretion to limit discovery where the discovery sought is "unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or can be obtained from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C). Limits also should be imposed where the burden or expense outweighs the likely benefits. *Id.* 

A party may request the production of any document within the scope of Rule 26(b). Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(a). "For each item or category, the response must either state that inspection and related activities will be permitted as requested or state an objection to the request, including the reasons." *Id.* at 34(b). The responding party is responsible for all items in "the responding party's possession, custody, or control." *Id.* at 34(a)(1). Actual possession, custody or control is not required. Rather, "[a] party may be ordered to produce a document in the possession of a non-party entity if that party has a legal right to obtain the document or has control over the entity who is in possession of the document. *Soto v. City of Concord*, 162 F.R.D. 603, 620 (N.D.Cal.1995).

## **Discussion**

The Court agrees with Plaintiff that the documents subpoenaed from his current employer are not relevant. The terms and conditions of Plaintiff's current employment have no bearing on whether Defendant classified Plaintiff correctly or improperly withheld wages. To the extent that

	Case 3:11-cv-00924-L -MDD Document 24 Filed 12/22/11 Page 3 of 3	
1	Plaintiff described Plaintiff's former employment in a job application or resume also is not relevant	
2	- the ultimate issue in this case is the work actually performed for Defendants by Plaintiff.	
3	<u>Conclusion</u>	
4	The subpoena issued by Defendants to Samuel Scott Financial Group is quashed. Samuel	
5	Scott Financial Group is not to produce any responsive documents.	
6	IT IS SO ORDERED:	
7	DATED: December 22, 2011	
8	Miterial De Mont	
9	Hon. Mitchell D. Dembin U.S. Magistrate Judge	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

- 3 - 11cv924-L (MDD)